



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"vision and faculty" which pierces to the heart, lays open the inward and the essential and sweeps away the accidental, the extraneous and the traditional,—the revealing power that enabled SCOTT to re-create the character of RICHARD, and CARLYLE, stimulated by his example, to hold up a vigorous and genuine presentment of the great Elector. When some ages are passed over, it may be that the calmer scrutiny of a distant generation will discern in MACAULAY'S finished and breathing pictures, some deeper semblance of truth than shadowy counterfeits and mythical delineations. The unapproached charm of his rhythm, the golden cadence of his periods is the specific transgression for which he will find it most difficult to obtain absolution at the hands of his censors and critics.

HENRY E. SHEPHERD.

College of Charleston.

THE NORTHUMBRIAN *Ebolsung*.

In the *Academy* of August 7, 1886 (p. 92), PROF. COOK has, under this heading, anticipated a point which he will no doubt further deal with in his long expected and much desired Northumbrian Grammar. The article may be briefly summed up as follows: While rejecting, for various reasons, the already proposed etymological connections of this word, he postulates for the first part of it an Old-English **æfwils*, the transition of which hypothetical form into the actual *ebols*, is also explained.

Before saying a word in favor of one of these rejected etyma, I must try to dispose of two later suggestions. One was offered a fortnight later by MR. A. L. MAYHEW on p. 147 of *Notes and Queries* (August 21, 1886). He there asked if the word is perhaps coradicate with *ābelgan*, 'to be indignant.' The actually occurring form *ebylðu* by the side of *ebylgðe* are instanced in support of this etymology, while for a reason which is not sufficiently clear to me, we are also referred to DR. MURRAY'S 'Dictionary' *in voce a-belgen*. Apart from the fact that INDIGNATIO—*ebylgðu*, is separated in sense from BLASPHEMIA—*ebolsung*, there are phonetic difficulties in the way, which justify us in saying that the argument does not hold. First of all, it

can hardly be supposed that the *g*, which is certainly part and parcel of the word, should have entirely disappeared in *all* the Northumbrian forms which are confessedly of some antiquity. Secondly, if the *g* could disappear, and if the West-Saxon suffix *ā* could correspond to the *e* in *ebolsong*, we should expect this to be demonstrated from Northumbrian and not from Mercian forms. And lastly, this etymology involves the question of the 'root vowel' in serious difficulties.

The second suggestion may be found in 'SIEVERS' Grammar,' second ed. § 43 *anm.* 4. It is to the effect that *eofolsian* is from **efhalsian*. We must again bear in mind that in this hypothetical form the stress is placed on the first *a*, and therefore in *eofolsian*, on the second *o*. This antepenultimate vowel occurs as *u*, *o*, *a*, *e*, in the following forms: *eobulsung*, *eofulsung*, *efolsian*, *ebolsung*, *ebalsia*, *yfelsian* (see PROF. COOK'S article); in the root syllable such a wide range of vowel symbols would not, I think, be found. It cannot be assumed, by the way, that *eofulsung*, etc., owe their forms to a supposed connection (through popular etymology) with *eoful*, *eofel*, 'evil,' and that therefore a shifting of the accent has taken place, for *eofel* (= *yfel*) is not usual in Northumbrian and is altogether too rare a form to have brought about this phenomenon, which, at the most, could only be the origin of *yfelsian*.

So these theories would seem to be unsatisfactory, and leave a better one to be desired. PROF. COOK does not believe in the anatomical process which cuts up the word *ebolsong*, into *ebol* and *song*, and justly so. There can be no doubt that, whatever the first element may be, MR. MAYHEW is right in suggesting the derivation of a verb in *-sian*. Although this is not COOK'S ultimate view, he would not, speaking *a priori*, seem to be dead against this.

As to the first element, and its connection with *yfel*, I would venture to break a lance. PROF. COOK is very emphatic on the subject: "The Northumbrian Gospels, like West-Saxon, know only the form *yfel*, and it is impossible to identify this with *ebol*. The *b* like the *f* does undoubtedly stand for the sonant labial spirant; but the *e* cannot represent the umlaut of *u*, to say nothing of the vowel of the second

syllable." "I am not aware that, apart from the form *yfelsap* (WRIGHT-WÜLKER 482,8), about which presently, the existence of this word has been demonstrated in West-Saxon. I adduce the following from a tenth century prayer in the MS. Vesp. D. 20 p. 88 b, which will be found printed in full in the forthcoming part of the *Anglia* (xi, p. 98): *Ic ondette modes morþor 7 mæne aðas únsibbe 7 eo fulsunge ofermetto, 7 ínnodennesses 7 receleaste godes beboda.*" Here is another difficulty thrown in the way of the connection with *ábelgan*. Now can we equate *eo* and *á* in West-Saxon?

Now I think PROF. COOK has overlooked the fact that *eo* (W.-S.) is the symbol of a vowel-value, in interchange, though exceedingly rarely, with *y*. If we perhaps doubt the ultimate West-Saxonhood of the *eo* in *eofulsæc* ('Elene,' 524), because all the epic poetry is of non-West-Saxon origin, the same can not be said of what occurs in the following passage of the A.-S. 'Boethius,' which is certainly of West-Saxon origin: *Hu mihtest ðu beon on midre þisse hwearfunga. ꝥ þu eac mid earefoþe sum eofel ne gefeldest.* We may now compare this W.-S. *eofulsunge* with *yfelsap* in the Bible glosses as quoted above, and we need not look upon the latter with COOK as a "clumsy attempt to Saxonise the Northumbrian form."

As to the chief difficulty, that of the Northumbrian *e*, which still remains unanswered, I can only ask if, in the light of this new form, the matter does not assume a different aspect. True enough, we may take COOK's word for it that in those remnants that have come down to us the Northumbrian ancestor of our present *evil* is always *yfel*, but it requires a knowledge of the Lindisfarne vowels, to which I can lay no claim to be able to say positively: West-Saxon *y* can never be Northumbrian *e*.

At this point PROF. COSIJN of Leiden has been good enough to place the following references at my disposal:

ðe geðence: TIBI VIDETUR, 'Matth.' 17, 25.
gebrece: FUNGERETUR, 'Luc.' 1, 8.
breting: FRACTIO, 'Luc.' 24, 25.
endebednis: ORDO, 'Luc.' 1, 8.

Now here are some cases where the umlaut of *u* undoubtedly has become *e* in Northumbrian. I think that we have no choice left, but to

look upon *ebolsian*, etc., viewed in this light, as derivatives of *efol*, etc. < W.-S. *yfel*.

H. LOGEMAN.

Haarlem, Holland.

A NEW MAGAZINE: POET-LORE.

THE CHEVALIER DE CHATELAIN, on the occasion of the three hundred and third anniversary of the birth of the poet of Avon, pierced with fine ridicule certain ambitious schemes of enthusiastic Shakespearians, proposed, three years before, at the tercentenary celebration. One plan, of which the CHEVALIER probably never heard, but which, like the others, was a complete and dreary failure, was the founding of a magazine, to become a depository of Shakespearian wisdom, and to be a sort of *Salon*, in which members of the guild, though more widely separated than Sicily is from Bohemia, might meet and talk. Where the Englishmen of 1864 failed, a young Philadelphian of 1883 succeeded. And in November of the latter year appeared the first number of *Shakespeariana*, "a journal designed to furnish a recognized medium for the interchange of ideas among Shakespearian scholars." It was most kindly received by the English press, welcomed by DOWDEN and HALLIWELL-PHILLIPS, and STAPFER and SCHMIDT, and the best of Continental scholars; and had, as well, the endorsement of OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, MATTHEW ARNOLD, and many a name familiar, and of great renown, outside the Shakespearian guild.

Its subsequent history has not been so fortunate, and its editorial management has been often changed. Its last issue, January 1889, dates from New York, and it is now directed by the New York Shakespeare Society, and is edited by MR. APPLETON MORGAN, author of the "Shakespeare-Myth."

The place of *Shakespeariana* has been taken in Philadelphia by a new and promising journal called "*Poet-Lore*: a monthly magazine devoted to SHAKESPEARE, BROWNING and the comparative study of literature." The last part of the title is significant, and if the editors really succeed in establishing for us, as in their editorial they promise, an American parallel to the *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteratur-Geschichte*, they will deserve, and doubtless receive, the gratitude